UNITY

FREEDOM, FELLOWSHIP AND CHARACTER IN RELIGION

(Jenkin Lloyd Jones, Editor, 1880-1918)

John Haynes Holmes
Editor in Chief

Louis L. Mann
Curtis W. Reese
Associate Editors

The Russian War-Plague in Britain
By Sydney Strong

Two Reports from Germany

Bernard Shaw—Missionary - *Harold P. Marley*

1932 in India - - - *Richard B. Gregg*

Schweitzer: Saint and Hero — A Book Review
- - - - - *By Clarence R. Skinner*

VOLUME CXI NUMBER 13

Chicago, May 29, 1933

PRICE TEN CENTS

UNITY

Established 1878

Published Weekly October to June — *Subscription $3.00*
Published Bi-Weekly July to September — *Single Copies 10 cents*

UNITY PUBLISHING CO., Abraham Lincoln Centre, 700 Oakwood Blvd., Chicago, Ill.
"Entered as Second-Class Matter July 30, 1931, at the Post Office at Chicago, Illinois, under Act of March 3, 1879."

JOHN HAYNES HOLMES, *Editor in Chief*
LOUIS L. MANN, CURTIS W. REESE, *Associate Editors*

Board of Directors

MRS. S. O. LEVINSON, President
MRS. E. L. LOBDELL, Vice-President
MRS. IRWIN S. ROSENFELS, Treasurer
MRS. FRANCIS NEILSON
MRS. ELLA R. NAGELY
MRS. O. T. KNIGHT
MR. IRWIN S. ROSENFELS
MR. C. W. REESE
MISS MATILDA C. SCHAFF
MRS. E. E. SMITH
MR. FRANCIS NEILSON
Secretary: MAY JOHNSON

Editorial Board

W. WALDEMAR W. ARGOW
RAYMOND B. BRAGG
EDMUND B. CHAFFEE
ZONA GALE
A. EUSTACE HAYDON
JESSE H. HOLMES
JOSEPH ERNEST MCAFEE
H. R. MUSSEY
ALSON H. ROBINSON
CLARENCE R. SKINNER
SYDNEY STRONG
ARTHUR L. WEATHERLY

Poetry Editors

LUCIA TRENT
RALPH CHEYNEY

Editorial Contributors

DOROTHY WALTON BINDER
PERCY M. DAWSON
JAMES A. FAIRLEY
M. C. OTTO
ROBERT C. SCHALLER
FREDERICK STARR
JABEZ T. SUNDERLAND
JAMES H. WEST

Foreign Representatives

AUSTRALIA—CHARLES STRONG
AUSTRIA—STEFAN ZWEIG
BULGARIA—P. M. MATTHÉEFF
ENGLAND—HARRISON BROWN
FRED HANKINSON
REGINALD REYNOLDS
CANADA—NORMAN STEWART DOWD
FRANCE—G. DEMARTIAL
ROMAIN ROLLAND
GERMANY—THEODOR HAHN
INDIA—RABINDRANATH TAGORE
JAPAN—NOBUICHIRO IMAOKA
PALESTINE—HANS KOHN
RUSSIA—ALINA HUEBSCH

Contents

EDITORIAL—

Notes 199
The Russian War-Plague in Britain—SYDNEY STRONG 201
Jottings—J. H. H. 203

ARTICLES—

Two Reports from Germany 204
Bernard Shaw—Missionary—HAROLD P. MARLEY 205
1932 in India—RICHARD B. GREGG 206

POETRY—

Chicago, 1933—CAROLINE MILLS HILL 199
To Eliot White—RALPH CHEYNEY 203
Sonnet—GEORGIANA BOLE KING 203
Thus My Soul—MONA MEDER NELSON 210

THE STUDY TABLE—

Schweitzer: Saint and Hero—CLARENCE R. SKINNER 208
Hymns and Poems—MARGUERITE EMILIO 210

THE FIELD—

A Humanist Manifesto—*The New Humanist* 198
Commonwealth Summer Camp 212

The Field

"The world is my country, to do good is my Religion."

A Humanist Manifesto

The time has come for widespread recognition of the radical changes in religious beliefs throughout the modern world. The time is past for mere revision of traditional attitudes. Science and economic change have disrupted the old beliefs. Religions the world over are under the necessity of coming to terms with new conditions created by a vastly increased knowledge and experience. In every field of human activity, the vital movement is now in the direction of a candid and explicit humanism. In order that religious humanism may be better understood we, the undersigned, desire to make certain affirmations which we believe the facts of our contemporary life demonstrate.

There is great danger of a final, and we believe fatal, identification of the word religion with doctrines and methods which have lost their significance and which are powerless to solve the problem of human living in the Twentieth Century. Religions have always been means for realizing the highest values of life. Their end has been accomplished through the interpretation of the total environing situation (theology or world view), the sense of values resulting therefrom (goal or ideal), and the technique (cult), established for realizing the satisfactory life. A change in any of these factors results in alteration of the outward forms of religion. This fact explains the changefulness of religions through the centuries. But through all changes religion itself remains constant in its quest for abiding values, an inseparable feature of human life.

Today man's larger understanding of the universe, his scientific achievements, and his deeper appreciation of brotherhood, have created a situation which requires a new statement of the means and purposes of religion. Such a vital, fearless, and frank religion capable of furnishing adequate social goals and personal satisfactions may appear to many people as a complete break with the past. While this age does owe a vast debt to the traditional religions, it is none the less obvious that any religion that can hope to be a synthesizing and dynamic force for today must be shaped for the needs of this age. To establish such a religion is a major necessity of the present. It is a responsibility which rests upon this generation. We therefore affirm the following:

First: Religious humanists regard the universe as self-existing and not created.

Second: Humanism believes that man is a part of nature and that he has emerged as the result of a continuous process.

Third: Holding an organic view of life, humanists find that the traditional dualism of mind and body must be rejected.

Fourth: Humanism recognizes that man's religious culture and civilization,

(*Continued on page* 211)

UNITY

"He Hath Made of One All Nations of Men"

Volume CXI MONDAY, MAY 29, 1933 Number 13

CHICAGO, 1933

[Dedicated to the World's Fair, opened on May 27]

Some laugh when we tell them
Chicago is beautiful;
For they read only of her dirt and crime,
They do not know her real self.

Our city's towers are more topless than those of Ilium,
They float above an ever-changing sea
Beckoning through an iridescent haze;
Our skyline is inspiration and power.

We have the nation's greatest citizen
Who has shown us our noblest self,
We have scholars in our universities
Who have searched the depths of our lowest selves,
We have artists and poets
Who have shown us the beauty in ugliness—
We have spiritual foundations.

Our city has gathered to itself all nations and tongues
Learning to speak one language,
Ready to be united for great purposes;
She has more people than all the colonies
When the Republic was born;
She has the soul of a world city—
She has international foundations.

Even her crime is upon a grand scale,
For her outlaws have copied big business
And there has been no government to hinder them;
Made from scores of villages and towns
With hundreds of taxing bodies
Overlapping and repeating—
Our city has no governmental foundations.

Our city was once consumed by fire
And reborn to a new destiny;
In the dream city of forty years ago
Her artistic life was born—
In this year she awaits her civic birth.

Our city is like a great plane poised for flight,
She has the food for a great voyage,
She has passengers with ambition and courage;
She could lead the world into a new era—
If she had a captain and a crew.

CAROLINE MILES HILL.

President Roosevelt's appeal to the nations of the world for disarmament and peace, a courageous and noble document, was published (May 16th) just before this issue of UNITY went to press. Chancellor Hitler's address to the Reichstag was scheduled to be spoken immediately after. We shall comment next week, after ample time to watch and ponder events, upon the momentous crisis precipitated by these utterances and the momentous consequences following therefrom.

The real statesmanship of the Roosevelt administration is seen in the industrial planning which is now occupying the attention of the "best minds" in Washington. The early banking and economy measures were mere devices, excellent in themselves, for meeting the emergency of a nation suddenly gone bankrupt. The Farm Relief Bill was an attempt to handle a situation so confused and crazy, and so little understood, that even legislation as crude as this may well be regarded as pardonable. The unemployment and relief proposals were a simple enactment of measures which should have been undertaken months ago by the Hoover administration to meet a dire and distressing crisis. Inflation, which was a mere grant of powers, was perhaps the one sure way of fighting off the dangerous ideas of financial fanatics of the Long and Wheeler type. These and other measures reveal an administration alert, vigorous, courageous, doing things which had to be done if a supreme catastrophe was to be avoided. But progress still remains a problem! What are we really going to do, not to overcome disaster, but to get out of this mess and make sure that we do not tumble in again? This is the real question, we must believe, which concerns Roosevelt and his advisers. And the first step in their program of advance must be contained in this industrial planning scheme, which the President has described as a "partnership" between the people and their government. What the details of this scheme may be, we do not know at this writing. That it will go far enough we doubt, for any complete plan of recovery, or rather re-creation, must involve not only a "partnership," but a genuine taking over of the people's proper business in natural resources, public utilities, and all large-scale production and manufacture of goods needful to life and happiness. But that this plan will be the greatest forward step since the first two years of Wison's first administration, and, in its attempt to coordinate and regulate the industrial activity of the nation, the most gigantic proposal in our history, of this we feel sure. Therefore we are all for it—and for the President who has conceived and presented it.

The talk about this Tariff Truce seems to us to be as grossly hypocritical a performance as we have encountered in a long time. One would think that this so-called "truce" meant something, promised something. As a matter of fact, it does nothing of the kind. It simply provides, if agreed upon, that during the continuance of the Economic Conference in London, no nation shall raise its tariff against another. In other words, that during the peace conference, no nation shall make war upon another! Even militarists are above this sort of thing. The very savages know how to be friends when they sit down to parley. But our modern economic powers, forsooth, must enter into solemn covenanted agreement, accompanied by much hesitation and arbitration, lest they murder one another while they talk. And this sort of thing is celebrated in the headlines of the newspapers as though it were a long step toward the reconciliation of the world! Well, when a man is drowning, we suppose he must inevitably clutch at straws. But why call a straw a beam, or a raft, or a staunch, seaworthy boat? The fact of the matter is, as this utterly ridiculous episode so clearly indicates, the great capitalistic powers—and the small ones, too—are coming to this London Conference armed to the teeth, prepared to ask everything and to concede nothing. So long as such a spirit prevails, little can be accomplished. Even though the senseless tariff war is temporarily suspended, it will only wax the fiercer when the suspension is lifted. To export all you can, and import as little as you can—to establish what is euphemistically called "a favorable balance of trade"—that way madness lies, and death as well. The Economic Conference may succeed. God, how we hope so! But the Tariff Truce is no more a sign of this success than twilight is of morning.

One thing is to be said for Hitler, and that is that he is making a clean job of it. Nothing is being overlooked. Thus, the Jews are being wiped out by the cruelest form of extinction known to history—the "dry," or "cold," program. Like the slow progress of a glacier, the persecution implicit in political and economic outlawry is counted upon to wipe out the 600,000 men and women who make up the body of Israel in Germany. The trades unions, by one swift stroke of policy, have been completely destroyed. The careful organization of the working people of the Reich through more than half a century of time has now crashed into wreckage as though under the shock of an earthquake. The Socialists, or Social Democrats as they are called in Germany, have similarly been "liquidated." All funds have been seized, all headquarters occupied, all leaders imprisoned or exiled, so that the party is as completely eliminated as though it had never been. As for the Communists, they have of course been swept up as so much vermin, and cast into the fires of oppression and destruction. The "reds" undoubtedly are operating "under ground"—they always do! But as an effectual political unit, they are dead. Groups to the right, as contrasted with those to the left, are also being put out of business, but by a different method. Instead of being destroyed, they are absorbed. Thus, the Hugenberg Nationalists have to all intents and purposes been made a part of the National Socialist Party. The "Steel Helmets" have been joined to the Nazi "Storm Troops." The Lutherans have been subdued and reorganized as a national church wholly obedient to the government. The Catholics have been allowed to live on promise to be "good." Yes, it's a complete job, a clean sweep. The world has never seen anything quite like it. Evidence accumulates that the Nazi leaders are fanatics of the worst sort, if not actually lunatics. But they seem to know exactly what they want to do; they seem to have the power to do it; and there seems to be no strength, courage, or even will on the part of any Germans anywhere to resist.

It was a terrible touse the world made in 1914 when Germany repudiated her neutrality treaty with Belgium and, under the plea of military necessity, made of it "a scrap of paper." The fact that the Allies were desperately eager to make out a case against Germany, and England as eager to find a first-class excuse to get into the war, seemed to cloud the indictment not a little. But there was a real moral issue involved, and the Kaiser's government never was able to shake off the odium of its act. But as time has gone on, the odium has seemed steadily "to fade into the light of common day." What Germany did, if the later practices of nations, not to speak of the former, are any criterion at all, was simply the routine thing. Thus, long before the War was over, in the ordinary course of that struggle, under the same easy plea of necessity, Japan violated the neutrality of China at will, and the European Allies made Greece the same sort of parade-ground that Germany had made Belgium. At the close of the War, the United States and Associated Powers tore up the Armistice agreement with the defeated Germans into scraps of paper so small as to make the Belgian treaty look like a document still in fairly good condition. In the years since Versailles, the merry game of betrayal and repudiation has gone steadily on. The latest instances are right now before us as the Economic Conference draws near. England, France, Belgium, Italy have borrowed money of the United States which they have solemnly pledged themselves to repay. Are they going to keep their word? Not if they can avoid it. France is only the most conspicuous among a group of nations which have aready defaulted. The United States, on her side, has borrowed money which she has promised to repay in gold or its full

equivalent. Is she going to do this? Not much! Her debtors will take their money in any old coin this government chooses to handle, and be darned lucky to get that. That there are economic aspects to this debt question which may well call for cancellation, we have long since declared in these columns. But this is not the issue now before us! We are talking of a nation's word, and the moral obligation to keep it. As a matter of fact, a nation recognizes no moral obligation, for the simple reason that there is no such thing as national morality. Governments are, and always have been, liars, thieves and swindlers on principle. So why get excited when London, Paris, Berlin, Washington do things that would disgrace a man forever?

How many unemployed are there in this country today? It is one of the crowning disgraces of the hour that nobody knows. Estimates run all the way from a minimum of 8,000,000 to a maximum of 15,000,000. This variation represents some considerable total—more than the electoral majority of Mr. Roosevelt over Mr. Hoover in the last campaign. In other great countries—England, Germany, France, for example—there are exact statistics, for the governments of these countries make it their business to handle such a problem as unemployment on a basis of exact knowledge. But here we know nothing. Even if we had the total of those without any jobs of any kind, this would not give us any exact picture of the situation. For how many men and women, occupying positions of one sort or another, are working only a part of each day or week? It is a common thing, we understand, for employers to keep their list of employees intact by keeping all on the pay-roll, but laying off one group this week, and another group next week, and so on. This tendency to part-time employment is just now being greatly accelerated by the so-called share-the-work plan of campaign. This idea of dividing up one man's job with two or three other men is excellent in motive. But it must be obvious to any sane mind that what is "share-the-work" from one angle is "share-the-idleness" from another angle. In other words in attempting to spread the work available, we are actually spreading the unemployment unavoidable. Which means that any estimated total of unemployment in this country today would be inadequate, since it would ignore this part-time experience of those who, if they are not starving, are semi-starving. The seriousness of the nation's plight cannot be exaggerated. The more reprehensible, therefore, is our persistent refusal to face reality, and thus deal with facts.

Radio City in New York, Rockefeller's elephantine splash and splurge, seems doomed to be ridiculous to the very end. The debacle at the opening is of course unforgettable—the two largest and most gorgeous playhouses in the metropolis dedicated with all the brass fanfares that money allied with brainlessness could provide, only to degenerate within a fortnight into two utterly cheap and commonplace moving-picture shows. Now comes the grand fuss over Rivera and his chromos. The silliness on both sides of this fracas is well-nigh incredible. On the one side, of course, Rivera should never have been invited to paint the murals on the vast spaces of these empty walls. We sympathize with the American artists who protested against his selection, not because we have any narrow parochialism or even nationalism in art, but simply because a Mexican artist is inevitably incompetent to understand, much less express, that American spirit which, for better or worse, went into the making of the Center. His pictures were bound to be as hopelessly out of place as a portrait by John Sargent in a ranch house on the Rio Grande. On the other side, Rivera, just to the extent that he is a genuine artist, should have declined the appointment. He knew what he wanted to do, perhaps the only thing he can do—the same glorious thing that he has done in Mexico City under the revolutionary regime. But there was about as much chance of the Rockefellers standing for such an exhibition of proletarian art in the corridors of their cherished mausoleum as there is of Stalin standing for the glorification of bourgeois capitalism on the walls of the Kremlin. The New York *Herald-Tribune* has made this point, and rightly so! After all, Rockefeller Center is what it is—the utterly tasteless, useless, meaningless exploitation of a civilization gone incurably to seed. Rivera should have scorned to work in such a place. That he consented to do so proves that, whatever he is as an artist, he is not much as a man.

The Russian War-Plague in Britain

1.—London Goes Mad

Studying the peace problem for the past eighteen months we have been a reader of seven or eight London dailies—including the Manchester *Guardian,* the most tolerant and true of all. For ten days these papers fed the public mind with scare headlines on the Moscow Trial. It was taken for granted that the Englishmen were innocent. The press was a 10-days cinema, with the Soviet GPU figuring as "villain." Pictures of the "victims" and the wives and children in England, heated editorials and edited descriptions of the trial—if ever a war-fever was worked up by the press, it was done during those ten days in April. And, to cap the climax, on Good Friday, the nation's Broadcasting introduced that portion of the Litany "to defend us from our enemies," the spokesman of the Kingdom as-

sured the citizens that the Englishmen could not be guilty, and the King took his stand at the head of a united public opinion, which said Russia is wrong! We watched this rising storm, as one might watch an oncoming hurricane, mad, unreasoning and full of deadly fury. (We raise here not the question of guilt or innocence—are only horrified at the discovery of the War-Plague raging in London, which could spell but Death and Hell.) We take at random from the papers, for practically all were plague-stricken, and quote only first-page material in large type, or editorial leaders.

Sunday Times carried editorial on *"Black Work at Moscow—the Terror Revealed."* Later, *"Four Moscow Victims Home Today."*

Sunday Express carried *"Embargo to Follow the Verdict"* and *"Messages Stopped."*

Sunday Dispatch carried *"Terror-Driven Accusers of Britons"* and *"Defiant Reply to Judge."*

Morning Post carried *"Moscow 'Trial' Ended," "Attack on Great Britain."*

Daily Mail carried editorial *"The Soviet Frame-Up."*

Daily Express carried *"Fierce Final Speech of Prosecutor"* and editorial *"The Terror Tribunal,"* and again on front page pictures of the Britons, also of the wives and families waiting for the verdict. *"Stared at Like Wild Animals,"* and *"How They Felt in the Dock."*

Telegraph carried editorial on *"Under Bayonet Guard"* and *"Hints at Hypnotism."*

Daily Herald carried *"Knew Russians Had Wrecked the Plant," "Forecasting of Sentences—10 Years in Exile"* mixed up with many pictures of children and wives and scare-headlines of *"Japan Sends Ultimatum to Russia—Red Forces Concentrate."*

News Chronicle with a running story from Moscow carried pictures and headlines calculated to prove innocence of Britons and to rouse hatred, for example: *"Prosecutor's Violent Speech," "Moscow Frame-Up," "Not Guilty," "Valuable Russian Witness Discredited," "The King and Moscow Prisoners," "Message from the King."*

Times, with dispatches from Riga (unreliable on Moscow news), referring with its customary snobbishness to the "Trial"—a paper which at every opportunity shows its hostility to Russia.

The above are but samples from pages of war-fever producing material, covering a fortnight, and closing with glowing accounts of the return of the engineers, and receptions such as heroes might envy.

The press carried no understanding of Russia's mind. We here indicate a deadly disease. Readers do not have a chance to know outside mentality. *This is dangerous.* London dailies actually carried on a campaign of propaganda against Russia calculated to make Britons fight. Personally, we have been horrified by it.

2.—A Scottish Minister Keeps Sane

Actually, the sight of London stricken with the war-plague fever filled us so with horror that we felt like Elijah making for a juniper-tree, or like Jonah crying out, "Nineveh shall be destroyed!" We knew that New York would be just as bad, if the plague struck her in the same way—but we are not satisfied to believe that our Anglo-Saxon race will forever play the silly fool, drunk with war-madness. . . . So we rejoiced when we read the following in the Manchester *Guardian* of April 25th. We give it verbatim:

The Moscow Trial Eulogized
Scottish Minister's Sermon
(From Our Correspondent)

Edinburgh, Monday.

Considerable comment has been provoked in Edinburgh by a sermon on the Moscow trial delivered in the Abbey Church last night by the Rev. Archibald Morrison, a Church of Scotland Minister. "Three cheers for Russia, the most Christian country in the world," said Mr. Morrison. The Moscow trial, he said, will always stand out as an example of the finest and cleanest and most just trials in history. Russia has had little cause to love the Church, but she could not stamp out religion any more than she could pull down the sun.

Russia had shown herself to be the most Christian nation for the following reasons:

Because she had given full freedom to women and equality with men; in Germany and Britain the function of women through all the centuries had been the "Church, children, and cooking." In Russia a working mother got two months' holiday before and two months after the birth of a child and full pay.

Because in all the schools in Russia there were no examinations or home lessons and no corporal punishment. Russia had taken upon herself the full responsibility of caring for the innocent child.

Because Russia was striving to make religion a means of life and not merely of things. Instead of rendering lip service only to Christ she was endeavoring to give practical expression to His teaching and His gospel.

I, as a professing Christian and busy citizen, said Mr. Morrison, take off my hat to Soviet Russia.

Interviewed today, Mr. Morrison said: A number of the elders of my Church shook hands with me after the service last night and thanked me for the sermon, which they said was honest and true. They are not Socialists; some of them are business men. The trial has made me turn more and more to Russia. If a war broke out between Britain and Russia tomorrow, I would fight for Russia.

Comment: We take off our hat to Archibald Morrison. It is a case of John Knox come to life! Not that we agree about "fighting," nor that we subscribe to all that he may say about Russia, but that in a season when London went mad over the Moscow trial, he had courage and tolerance to stand openly for what he believed to be the truth. As a minister, also, we are glad, for it is such men as Mr. Morrison who will help people to retain faith in God and truth, in the midst of "a crooked generation." May his tribe increase! It is such men who are genuine patriots.

3.—What Russia Might Fitly Do in the Matter of "Recognition"

In the interests of world peace, the time has come when what is called the "recognition of Russia" should be settled. Britain has been wiser than America, be-

cause her trade nerve is more sensitive. America has been plumb fool to lose both trade and good-will. There is nothing more silly and blasphemous at Geneva than to see America's representatives sitting in the same room with the Soviets in the name of Peace, and yet refusing to speak. In this particular, we of American ancestry for over 300 years, are thoroughly ashamed—for America acts like an eight year old school girl. It would be well for our President to phone Mr. Davis, "First thing in the morning, go over and shake with the Soviets. Do it *de facto* or *de jure*—left hand or right—take your choice." The press gallery would then wake up! . . .

If we were Russia, we are inclined to think that we would decline to "recognize" America and Britain—honest—for the following reasons:

1. They have contracted the habit of shirking acknowledged debts.
2. They have the habit of seeking to divide and conquer where they go.
3. They are holding down millions, by the force of guns or money.
4. They use God and the Church as sanction for conquest.
5. They even cultivate race prejudice and discrimination.
6. They have many medieval institutions, which are dangerous to our ideals, such as kings, bishops and nobles—and as revealed in "monkey-trials," "Scotsboro case," Ku Klux Klans, lynchings, corrupt city government (witness Tammany and Chicago), prize-fighting, racketeers, etc., etc.
7. They withhold citizens' rights from millions of black, brown and red men.
8. They withhold civic and social rights from women—as equals of men.
9. They waged war (undeclared) against Russia in Siberia and Archangel—destroying life and property—and never even apologized.

So, America and Britain, it will be wiser for us to keep from entangling alliances, to stay at home and major in the sickle (tractor) and hammer (factories) and build up a splendid, classless society where all work and all share, with no unemployed. We are not anxious to "move in good society," with its debasing habits that spring from luxury, inequality and idleness.

Glad to have you come and see us when you are studying the latest technique in farming, education, hygiene, economics, government, aviation, art, medicine and music. We welcome you, but *come only as visitors.* Our Intourist Bureau will care for you. . . We cannot trust you yet as full neighbors, because of the danger of association to our institutions and children. Meanwhile, we'll cultivate those neighbors possessing good will.

Best wishes in "your experiments." Good luck. *Au revoir. Pax vobiscum.*

SYDNEY STRONG.

Geneva, Switzerland.

Jottings

There is a steamship plying between New York and Europe which is named "American Banker." How does she get any passengers?

Chicago's world fair is called *"Century of Progress."* Is this Fair serious, or is it a joke?

We can't understand it! The Nazis, in their great bonfires the other day, burned Jewish books—and yet preserved the Old Testament; they burned pacifist books—and yet spared the Sermon on the Mount; they burned Socialist books—and yet did not include Bernard Shaw. These Hitlerites are a spineless lot, after all!

Who says that democracy is dead? Has not the Prince of Monaco just announced that he will restore constitutional government to the people of his realm? Let Mussolini take notice, and Hitler warning!

Herman Metz, recently returned from Germany, declares that Americans do not object to what the Hitlerites are doing to the Communists. Is this so? If so, it is to our everlasting shame. We hold no brief for Communists, but do think that they have the same right to live as other men.

If We Were a Newspaper Editor: (7) *We would publish news,* and *not* comic strips, cross-word puzzles, advice to the love-lorn, dressmaking hints, woman's chat, bed-time stories, and serial novels.

J. H. H.

To Eliot White

Transfiguration is the heart of fact.
That what is human may become divine
We know by many a clear and happy sign—
For human nature changes, all it lacked
Of sacrifice and kindliness and tact
Becomes its own within the halo-shine
Of love. With more like you, it yet shall twine
Like Saturn's ring and light our every act.

But that divine should turn to human, stirred
By love for man, was miracle too strange
For my weak faith until you lived His grace.
Transfiguration echoes through your word.
Beneath the masks of men, the thorns of change
And crown of love, I see the Single Face.

RALPH CHEYNEY.

Sonnet

I cannot think a world so fair was meant
For warring minds that scheme to hate and kill;
A world where stars come low to crown a hill
Must surely have been fashioned for content.
And yet, how often is its quiet rent
By cries of those whose needs have made men ill,
Who tread unseeing on the daffodil,
Nor heed the bough with petaled promise bent.

How long will man be satisfied with less
Than beauty which is patterned after peace?
Is there no language strong enough to tell
His stubborn heart there is a sure redress,
A certain path of love that brings release,
An exit from his silly self-made hell?

GEORGIANA BOLE KING.

Two Reports from Germany

I

For fourteen years Germany was the most liberal nation in the world. Everybody could do and say what he wanted to, as long as he did not endanger the lives and property of his fellow-citizens. Each citizen felt responsible for the government of the country. He was not only authorized but was obliged to have some kind of opinion in politics and to give an expression through voting at the polls.

But the majority of the German people longed for the good old days when nobody needed to think, and everybody had to obey. Adolf Hitler knows German mentality, and knows their longing as well as their joy to be in uniforms, expressing militarist ideals. Therefore he succeeded in collecting this majority in his party, and supported by it he obtained dictatorial powers. To his party he introduced military drill, a thing which runs in the blood of the Germans, forced into them through Frederick the Great and especially since the foundation of the Reich after the Franco-German War in 1871.

But he not only calculated on the old nationalistic feelings; to the term "national" he aded "social" and even "Socialistic," and therefore appealed to the modern political movements which since the end of the last century have grown more and more popular in Germany.

With this he united a psychological understanding of the mentality of the Germans, who were following him in great numbers. Another very successful means of propaganda was anti-Semitism. The Jews were blamed by Hitler for all the trouble and misery Germany has undergone since the War. Faithfully everyone looked up to the *"Fuehrer"* (leader) who promised to end "Jewish and Marxian domination" and again would raise Germany to the position of the most powerful and esteemed nation in the world. (There has never been a Social-Democratic government in Germany since 1918, only coalition governments).

Unlike all other parties, Hitler did not put up a program. Hitler's own name was program enough. He promised to end all misery and his followers believed him and were willing to live and die for him.

With the election of the Reichstag on the 5th of March, 1933, based upon the lie of the Reichstags fire, Hitler came into power by a majority of nearly 53%, after all Germans were debarred from any freedom of opinion. "Those who are not for me are against me," said Hitler. Acting on this principle with all means of terrorism at his disposal, he tried to restore law and order (as he saw it). Really this was quite necessary because political competition had run so high that a kind of guerilla warfare had broken out between the citizens, and there were a tremendous lot of casualties. Marxian and liberal leaders were arrested; many were ill-treated and put into prison or concentration-camps, in which alone there are now 35,000. Their newspapers were forbidden, their books confiscated and publicly burned, and all secret and of course public meetings made impossible. The millions of Social Democrats, Communists and the rest were just swept away. Hitler proposes to exterminate Marxism so that in fifty years' time no one will know that anything of the kind ever existed.

Hand in hand with the suppression of these rather helpless opponents of Fascism, strong measures against Jews were inflicted. Nearly all of the Jews were dismissed from their positions. They and their children were not allowed to enter public buildings (law courts, hospitals, schools, stock exchanges, and universities). The "Arian" people were called upon to boycott Jewish shops, warehouses and co-operatives. So the Jews were deprived of all means of existence; their children could not go on with their studies. Many escaped over the frontier to escape persecutions. But even this outlet was soon cut off, because the government feared the voices of other nations, as they were beginning to be heard against these persecutions in Germany. One ought to be grateful to these voices, as it was really these which stopped worse outrages against Jews. Hitler himself did not intend to do anything of this sort; he said that not one hair of the Jewish heads would be hurt, but he could not calm down the goaded minds of his followers so soon. Therefore he had to let things go.

The German "revolution" is supposed to be finished now. Marxians have disappeared. No adverse voice will be heard in the near future. The newspapers are full of praise for Hitler. Jews have been removed. Hitler forced his way to the top by the worst methods possible. Now he has to prove that behind the great orator is a great statesman, prepared to fulfil his promises.

It will be difficult to be just to everyone. Farmers as well as laborers, intellectuals as well as industrialists trust their "leader," and he has promised all of them improvement of conditions. At present Germany has 7,000,000 unemployed. Hitler has stated that in four years' time (4 Years' Plan) there would be no unemployed!

Again a few men have the destiny of millions in their hands—millions who show that they are still unable to govern themselves.

X. Y. Z.*

II

The Nazi Government, thanks to the most brutal terror and most unscrupulous use of all the means of propaganda in their hands, have obtained a complete victory. The Communist party is completely defeated and, with the exception of a few small centers of resistance, wiped out. Even the Socialist party (S. D. P.) has been severely attacked, as the figures of arrests show. Its press is banned, all workers' organizations (except the T U.'s, which will make their peace with Fascism) have been dissolved; no meetings are allowed nor are there possibilities of maintaining contact.

The present situation is especially bad, because it will have manifold repercussions internationally as well as in Germany. The victory of Fascism in Germany necessarily strengthens the Fascist forces elsewhere, and even while I do not believe that it will inevitably involve war, yet we must be prepared for the worst. The success of the Nazis rests mainly upon the fact that its leaders and its supporters are "blind"—i. e., they rely upon mere emotion arising from uncontrolled and uncontrollable sufferings. The whole people is enraged and worked up "en masse," as we have never before

*The German authors of these reports are known, but the names for obvious reasons cannot be published.—Editor.

known it, and what will be cooked out of the witches' cauldron, if the present holders of power are faced with any serious resistance, is impossible to foresee. Such opposition is doubtless likely to arise in many circles because of the suggestions and promises which A. Hitler has so freely made, which can in nowise be fulfilled in internal nor external affairs, and especially not in economic and social questions.

The great hope for the German left-wing lies in the fact that considerable sections of the present Nazi voters are really Socialists and that Hitler can never carry out their wishes. And that not only because he has pledged himself to the big industrial and landed interests, but because his whole ideology makes impossible for him a development towards a really Socialistic policy. Hitler is, and remains, a *"petit bourgeois."* His leadership can and will have no other effect than—as happened with Italian Fascism—to stabilize capitalism on its present basis. It will therefore, after the lapse of a certain time, in spite of its unprecedented powers today—no German Government has ever disposed of such vast powers—admit its bankruptcy. This bankruptcy will come at the latest in the course of the next few years if the expected economic improvement declines in a new crisis.

I myself reckon that it will be at least ten years before it will be possible effectively to oppose National Socialism, for at present the belief in its omnipotence is unshakable and also the building up of opposition efficient enough to overcome it will not be possible in a brief space of time because a complete re-orientation of thought and ideology and a complete reconstruction organization are needed. B*

Berlin, Germany.

Bernard Shaw—Missionary

Natives in the American jungle didn't like the serious remarks addressed to them by the missionary from overseas. They shifted nervously when he mentioned the bad slump of our system which was breaking up due to a rather serious earthquake. A Hollywood actress called him a little boy hiding behind whiskers, and the New York *Times* in an editorial on "A Tragic Comedian," flayed his childlike conceptions, calling them worthy of a "dryasdust professor."

As a matter of fact, in his Irish way he preached the gospel truth, and we in our hundred percent American way, could not take it. He was no *enfant terrible,* but a simple missionary who proclaimed a kingdom on earth, as in heaven, where a reorganized political life might insure individual happiness and social sanity. It is conceivable that Americans might have been willing to have their political God, the Constitution, taken away, but his references to our Messiah, the President, caused us to raise our fetish with dismay and radio operators broke in with raucous noises. Still more impudent were the favorable words he had to say about Russia, even though he gave American engineers great credit for the Soviet success and hinted in the end that America might even regain her world leadership.

Although this was the first time Shaw has stood before an American audience, he has countless times spoken his mind to America across the footlights through the lips of a Saint Joan, a Don Juan, an Adam, or Eve, or these same characters dressed in modern costume. Theater-goers could laugh off those speeches because they lacked the personal application. His satire on war ("Arms and the Man") applied to the Balkans; his story of martyrdom ("Saint Joan") happened a long time ago and furnished Broadway a laugh on the English "goddams"; and his "Apple Cart" actually poked fun at his own beloved Socialism. America is quite willing to go "Back to Methuselah" with this all-knowing sage, but shuns the view ahead. So long as this missionary talks in riddles we pay money to sit and laugh, but when he learns our language and speaks our own tongue, even to the "sock in the jaw," then we rebel.

As a matter of fact, what Shaw said to the Japanese was far more insulting. "I think it (Japan) is perfectly horrible," were his first words, and he bore out this impression by mentioning such things as child labor, the smashing of the League, suicide rate and other things, not to exclude the Japanese government. "I came to Japan prepared for the beauty described by Lafcadio Hearn, and I came into a hell," is plain speaking for an English missionary so far from home. The world will have to get used to such talk, for whether civilization is lost or saved, we are going to hear voices raised in its behalf. We may do the cannibalistic thing and boil these new-type missionaries in cauldrons of our rhetorical oil, but this will not silence them.

That George Bernard Shaw has a religious fervor cannot be doubted. Long before the "Black Girl" set out to find God from the depth of the African jungle, he had been writing of ministers, the church, Biblical problems. Nearly every play drags in a man in clerical garb, not so much to ridicule the profession as to strive toward perfection. As a boy, young George beheld his uncle in Dublin champion the cause of home rule for Ireland in his church, and as a vestryman he threw the force of his influence behind the church in the early days of this century. As a youth of nineteen he wandered into a Moody-Sankey revival meeting with the reaction that "if that is religion, I am an atheist." Since that time, like the black girl with her native blackjack, he has been engaged in life-questing, knocking over favorite ecclesiastical idols which he considers useless, but ever reaching out toward a fuller expression of the religious urge. Church people will not like "The Adventures of the Black Girl in Her Search for God" any more than Americans liked to hear their Constitution scrapped, but instead of fuming like Canon Streeter recently did, it would be better to listen respectfully. It is not easy for whites, schooled in religion and science, to listen to the jibes of a naked black girl having a saucy expression on her face like the Da Vinci Mona Lisa. We are tempted to shoot, as was the woman scientist in the forest, thus establishing our superiority with "a sock in the jaw" rather than calling in a policeman to arbitrate the argument. This is what Streeter did when he drew himself up in all his J-E-D-P wisdom and scornfully pointed out that Mr. Shaw's chronology was bad—putting the God of Job before the God of Micah. Not being content to refute him on intellectual grounds, he eyed him suspiciously on moral grounds, as the white woman in the forest eyed the black girl. Masochism, is hardly the word to

apply to a man whose life is an open book (see published correspondence with Ellen Terry) and which, according to an editorial in a Japanese newspaper, "in its smokeless and liquorless discipline would surely make a model for a Sunday School treatise."

The fact of the matter is that the church must have some of its idols smashed, and it should be glad that it has someone who can do it with the good spirit of this iconoclastic missionary. As to the supreme idol of all, the God idol, this generation has been forced to accept a God which has slight similarity with any of the older conceptions. The Master Mathematician God of Jeans, which enlightened churchmen accept today, because they must accept a God which squares with science, is hardly to be preferred to that which the black girl finally finds, viz., the God of contented and mature living. The attack which Shaw makes on Dr. Pavlov and the other scientists should be capitalized by the church, for science has not added an iota to the God concept, which it only embraced in an effort to make the universe hang together more intelligibly. If there is a God, Sir Launfal was correct in pointing out that geography has nothing to do with the matter (nor astronomy), and Shaw's reiteration of this truth through Voltaire's advice to the black girl makes it the more impressive. Humanists and theists in religion and scientists will in the end come to agree with Shaw that the significant thing in life is the living of it. Many harp-strings of religion which made pleasing sounds to the ears must be severed by the spear of truth, but what of it? The human spirit craves harmony, and will in the end affix other strings.

Again, the church should be glad that this missionary has the social gospel. Unlike such critics as Aldous Huxley, he comes proclaiming that the kingdom is at hand. It may be a Socialist state we will have, with nationalized banks, brought on by farmers in armed revolt acting under the drive which animated the Mormons in another way, but it will be an improvement over the present order. It is fortunate that this able critic, compared to Moliere, is doing for society what the French playwright did for the individual, and that his knowledge of Socialism gained through long devotion to the cause of the Fabian society is more rugged than the ordinary parlor variety. The man who waited until he was seventy-six to come to America, and then confined himself to one speech, is surely a missionary of a new kind, but he is undoubtedly spreading the good news of a new day. He is doing just what he told the New York audience and the millions of Americans who listened in, he was doing—preaching!

It is true that this man who used the theater as a forum for ideas rather than as a place to display the sexual eccentricities of smart society, is not an authority in the field of religion or science. Men from within the ranks could and do criticize more accurately. But the Constitution which we rallied to support the night he spoke, guarantees free speech. Criticism, even by those not authorities in bank matters, church history, or pure science, helps provide perspective. When there is a barb attached, Americans, churchmen and others don't like it, but it does no good to ring the curtain down. We would do best to go through the third act and be sure that we shoot the right villain.

HAROLD P. MARLEY.

1932 in India

The British Government has published its detailed proposals for a new constitution for India. From sundry British sources we are being told that the prestige of the Indian National Congress is "now at a very low ebb"; that law and order have been restored; and that the "sane" Indian politicians realize that civil disobedience is barren and they are, therefore, getting ready to take active part in "constructive work" for launching the new constitution. It is therefore a suitable time to review the events of the Indian struggle during the past year.

The first part of 1932 was taken up by the savage attempt of the government to crush the Congress, by the ordinances and their administration, including a rigid censorship which still continues. The government publicly announced in January, 1932, that it would fight the Congress movement "with all our might." The attack failed. Not only does the Congress survive;—it compelled Prime Minister MacDonald to admit, nearly five months after the launching of the attack, that "there can be no doubt but that during the past year very formidable obstacles have been put in the way of an Indian settlement by Indian Congress methods"; and on September 5, eight months after the beginning of the attack and two months after the renewal of the ordinances, the Viceroy, speaking before the Indian National Assembly, said, "The Congress is an extensive organization which commands even outside its own ranks a certain degree of sympathy among many of the educated classes." During the year there have been numerous other British admissions, official and non-official, that the Congress is the largest and best organized political party in India. The renewal of the ordinances in July and the compelling of their enactment into statute laws by the pliable Indian legislators at the end of the year is not only an admission of the failure of British policy, but also clear proof of its intent to continue the attack on the Congress and against the entire Indian people. The nature of that attack and of the Indian response are shown by two statements—one by Mr. Rajendra Prasad, acting President of the Indian National Congress, and the other by Sir Charles Tegart, recently Commissioner of Police in Calcutta and now a member of the Council of India. Mr. Prasad is personally well known to me, and I vouch for his scrupulous honesty and carefulness of statement. Reviewing the events of 1932, Mr. Prasad wrote on January 4, 1933, the anniversary of Gandhi's arrest:

"The details of ordinance and extra-ordinance repression in the country at large are a matter of common knowledge and experience to the people. Not only have more than one hundred thousand men, women and children been arrested, detained, and clapped into prisons, but hundreds have lost their limbs and lives as a result of firing on unarmed crowds. Many have died in jails and thousands have been victims of lathi charges on crowds and merciless beating administered in lock-ups, police stations, and prisons. Even women have not been spared and have been grossly insulted and brutally treated. Hundreds of boys of tender age have been caned and imprisoned.

Hundreds, again, have been subject to tortures of a most revolting character, the form and intensity of which have varied according to the intelligence, ingenuity, callousness, and cruelty of the officers responsible for them. Thousands have lost their property as a result of authorized fines and forfeiture and unauthorized loot and vandalism of the police."

In a lecture in London on Nov. 1 last, "Sir Charles Tegart warned his hearers against any confusion between the civil disobedience and the terrorist movements," says the *London Times* of Nov. 2. "He said they were fundamentally different, though both aimed at paralyzing the government. Civil disobedience, which was run by the National Congress, was an all-India movement intended by its authors to be non-violent. It courted publicity; and it relied on mass demonstrations and picketing; its followers were mostly illiterate. Terrorism had different leaders, though they had penetrated the Congress machine in Bengal." This admission by a high British official that the Indian Congress movement is predominantly non-violent has been substantiated by many responsible British and American journalists and eye-witnesses, and also by the astonishingly small number of violent attacks against British officials and nonofficials in India, as reported by the government authority in charge of law and order. This absence of violence in spite of such sufferings in a struggle for independence is unique in world history.

The mass demonstrations by Congress followers continued in various parts of the country through more than eight months. Since October they have died down because of the severity of the repression and the imprisonment of the most disciplined leaders. Yet frequent demonstrations continue to be made by individuals and small groups in most of the provinces. The British assert that this abandonment of the large demonstrations by Congress men and women shows that civil disobedience has been crushed and proves the complete failure of Gandhi's method. But such an assertion overlooks the intangibles. Though civil disobedience has not yet gained its final objectives it has achieved great results and is still operating. It has caused the British Government to reveal clearly to all Indians that its authority is based on brutality, and thereby, as Tagore has pointed out, completely ended the former moral prestige of the British among Indians. As a result, millions of Indians no longer respect or trust the British but have transferred those feelings and their sympathy to the Indian Congress. Furthermore, among practically all the Congressmen and millions of other Indians, the campaign of civil disobedience has virtually ended the former inferiority complex which so many of them had. They have learned to be both self-confident and fearless.

There has been, therefore, a great increase in the inner strength of the Congress members, a great increase in moral support for the Congress among other Indians and in liberal groups in all other countries, a great loss of British prestige in India, and everywhere increasing skepticism of British political skill. It is true that there has been in India for the time being a change, as it were, from warfare of movement to warfare of position, but in the change the British have lost considerable ground. Very decidedly, civil disobedience has been successful, and still works powerfully.

The next important event of the year was Gandhi's fast, as a result of the Communal Decision of the British Government. This brought about first the Poona Pact, greatly increasing the political power of the untouchables and preventing them from being made into a separate political community. Subsequently, the reform has extended into the social, economic, educational, and religious spheres. Immense and rapid strides have been taken to remove untouchability from every corner of India. The movement has gained great momentum and is being carried on with much energy, enthusiasm, and determination, so that untouchability will probably be completely ended within a very few years and perhaps sooner.

This reform and unification of Hinduism has already added to the prestige of Gandhi and the Congress. It will also increase the respect of the democratic Moslems for the Hindus. It was a factor in starting the third great event of the year—the Unity Conference and Allahabad Agreement between important leaders of Hindus, Moslems, Sikhs, Indian Christians, and Parsees. Though the agreement finally did not quite secure complete ratification everywhere, it came very close, and already further efforts are under way. It marked a great increase in inter-communal harmony and unity. Furthermore, it resulted in considerably weakening the former Moslem support of the Moslem old guard of loyalists.

The struggle in India is to determine who has controlling political and economic power—the British or Nationalist Indians. When that question is settled, a constitution can be worked out with relative ease. Until it is settled, no constitution will work. For this reason the Third Round Table Conference cannot be considered an important event. The purpose of these conferences is to try to build a constitutional structure which will enable the British to retain control behind a screen of a few Indians who benefit by British control and want to retain their privileges. Unless such Indian loyalists can win considerable popular acquiescence and support, they cannot run the new machine, the plan will fail and the British will have to prepare to leave. But the ordinances, the imprisonment of Gandhi and other Congress leaders, and the failure of the British constitutional proposals to yield any increase of self-government have made it impossible for the loyalists to win any support. In fact, what little following they had previously is steadily dwindling.

Turning to the British side of the matter, we find that in relation to this problem the British have during the past year lost in unity and confidence among themselves. For probably the first time in the history of the British connection with India there is now an active British organization, containing many influential members, strongly opposed to a conservative policy of the Government in India. This organization is the India League, whose chairman is Lord Bertrand Russell. Probably largely because of the efforts of this group, the Labor Party abstained from taking part in the third Round Table Conference. In this connection we may recall the statement made by Mr. Stanley Baldwin in the House of Commons shortly after the first Round Table Conference. Speaking of the necessity for unanimity among all the British political parties in regard to Indian policy, he was reported by the London *Times* to have said, "Break up that unanimity and no man in this House as Prime Minister or Secretary of State has any chance of coping with the government

of India." On the other hand, at the Conservative Party conference at Blackpool last October there was bitter criticism by a large and powerful section of the conference, directed at Sir Samuel Hoare and the Government's proposed "reforms" in India. Only by adroit maneuvering did the Government escape open censure by the party which has an overwhelming majority in the House of Commons. Again, on February 28th of this year at a meeting of the National Union of Conservative Associations, representing the rank and file throughout the country, a resolution opposing the Government's general policy in India was defeated by a narrow majority of 165 to 189. Even among the Tories themselves there is lack of agreement, for we find the *Week End Review,* edited by young Conservatives, now advocating a general amnesty of all Indian political prisoners. A conflict of financial interest has developed between the heavily taxed British business men of India and the British Government officials there who have had their pay cut and want it restored. This found expression in a resolution at a January (1933) meeting of the British Associated Chamber of Commerce in Calcutta, urging that any future improvement in Government finances should result in decreases of taxes rather than increases of officials' pay. Lancashire manufacturers have also been passing angry resolutions against the government for allowing the existing Indian tariffs against cotton goods. As an indication of the attitude of the young men who might have been candidates for Government service, during the past year it was reported that the Oxford Union, and the Cambridge Union, after strenuous debates, passed resolutions strongly condemning the policy of the Government in India. This moral and political disunity is not sufficient to prevent Parliament from enacting the new Indian Constitution, but it will be a factor in causing the prompt and complete failure of that constitution in India.

Varying degrees of gloom have been expressed during the year by many persons, including Lord Irwin, Lord Meston, Lord Gorell, and Mr. Rushbrook Williams, and by such weekly British journals as the *Economist, New Statesman and Nation, Manchester Guardian, Saturday Review, Observer* and *National Review.* The London *Times* reported grave discouragement among British members of the Indian Civil Service expressed at a meeting in the United Provinces in early May, and again at a meeting of some of them in London on June 9. At the annual Calcutta dinner in London on May 26, Sir Hugh Stephenson, recently retired governor of Bihar & Orissa, and former governor of Bengal, was reported to have said that "the great lesson of his official career in India was that even a government of all the talents could not now carry on without the assistance of the various elements making up the community." In an article in the *Nineteenth Century and After* for January, 1933, the Earl of Iddesleigh writes, "We have gone too far for retreat to be possible, and regrets are as unavailing as the hopes of any final settlement of the Indian problem are baseless."

RICHARD B. GREGG.

The Study Table

Schweitzer: Saint and Hero

Like Gandhi, Albert Schweitzer was for a long time almost unknown in the United States. His reputation has been growing rapidly in recent years, however, until he is now recognized as one of the most universal geniuses of our time. He is more than one man—he is at least four. He reminds us in his breadth and varying capacity of Leonardo da Vinci. In the first place, he has achieved a predominant position among modern theologians by his books on the "Quest of the Historical Jesus" and the "Mysticism of Paul." Secondly, he is probably the greatest authority in the modern world on Bach, and has undoubtedly written the best interpretation of that great master. Thirdly, he has toured Europe as one of the greatest living organists, and is an authority on the history and structure of the organ. Fourthly, he has become a great physician, giving his services to the African natives, building a hospital out of the proceeds of his lecturing and playing. In between times he has written histories, philosophies of civilizations; has been minister in churches; has carried on a tremendous correspondence all over the world; and this book* is the thirteenth which he has turned out in the midst of this tremendously busy career.

The subject of this autobiography was born in 1875 in Alsace, where he had an international background, being closely in touch with both German and French people, although the German language was his mother tongue and the cultural background of his home was more typically German than French.

Those who believe that early training is of paramount importance in shaping later life will be interested to know that when the child was only five years of age his father began giving him music lessons on an old square piano. At seven he played his own hymn tunes; at eight, when his legs could hardly reach the pedals, he learned to play the organ; and at nine he took the place of the regular organist at a service in Günsbach.

At the Gymnasium, Schweitzer learned to love the mastery of difficult subjects and to take especial joy in struggling with those branches of learning which were the hardest for him. He was not always at the top of his class but was reckoned as one of the better students, always tremendously in earnest, so much so that he attracted the notice of some of the outstanding teachers of his locality and time.

In '93 he entered the Strassburg University, living in the Theological College of St. Thomas. In his theological preparation he became deeply interested in the question of the historical versus the mythical Jesus. He early cast doubts upon the popular interpretations of Jesus which depicted him as an unearthly and wholly spiritual being separated from the immediate concerns of his fellow-

*"Out of My Life and Thought." An Autobiography, by Albert Schweitzer. Translated by C. T. Campion. Henry Holt & Co., publishers. $2.50.

men. He received both criticism and encouragement from various members of the faculty.

In order to keep up his interest in music, he took frequent trips to Paris, tickets being given to him by friends and the balance of the expense being met by sacrifices which he made, even going with one meal a day.

After passing the theological examination he steeped himself in philosophy, beginning with Aristotle and Plato and grappling with the great fundamental problems as set forth by the outstanding philosophers down to modern times. He was especially attracted by the religious aspects of Kant, and later followed this up with a thorough-going thesis.

Frequent trips to Berlin acquainted him with the culture of that city, which he said at that time was at its height. He made himself at home in the libraries there, and was able to gain admittance to the homes of many of the finest families.

During all this time Schweitzer kept to his passion for preaching. Many of the philosophers of his University urged him to become Privat-Dozent and confine himself to the field of academic philosophy, but "to me preaching was a necessity of my being. I felt it as something wonderful that I was allowed to address a congregation every Sunday about the deepest questions of life." He therefore obtained a post as preacher in Strassburg, first as deacon and later as curate. He was given the task of speaking mostly in the afternoon services to a small group of worshippers and thus developed the conversational type of speaking which he liked best. Even today Schweitzer does not like great audiences and is rather shy before crowds. His stipend was five pounds a month, but his living was on a very simple scale and he found that this amount sufficed for the necessities of his life.

He was a man of unlimited physical and mental strength, spending himself without any sense of restraint. He worked long hours with tremendous concentration but learned to be unhurried and unworried, which largely accounts for the unprecedented output of intellectual work during his life.

In 1900 Schweitzer obtained the degree of Licentiate in Theology, which led in 1902 to the position of Privat-Dozent at the University. He there again became interested in the question of the nature of Jesus, especially in relation to the late Jewish Messianic ideology. Schweitzer insisted that Jesus accepted this late Jewish view in all externalities and in no way attempted to spiritualize it. He filled it with ethical content, but he believed that there would be a miraculous end of the world. This teaching today does not strike a strange chord in our minds because it has been more or less adequately established by Biblical scholarship, but for his day it was a very radical point of view. These studies were finally put together into the volume "The Quest of the Historical Jesus" which first appeared in 1906. The volume met with instant recognition in England and has since been translated into many languages, and marks an epoch in our understanding of Christ's character.

On October 13, a Friday in 1905, Schweitzer came to a critical period in his life, for he made known his decision to study medicine for the purpose of going to equatorial Africa as a missionary. His reasons are of especial interest. In the first place, he did not feel that it was right for him to live such a happy life when there were so many people around him suffering; and in the second place, he felt that it was not enough to merely preach about the problems of existence, but it was necessary to do something about them. He made a compromise by resolving that until he was thirty years of age he would live for science and art, and after that he would give his life wholly to human service. His comment upon this decision is of great interest: "Only a person who can find a value in every sort of activity and devote himself to each one with full consciousness of duty, has the inward right to take as his object some extraordinary activity instead of that which falls naturally to his lot. Only a person who feels his preference to be a matter of course, not something out of the ordinary, and who has no thought of heroism, but just recognizes a duty undertaken with sober enthusiasm, is capable of becoming a spiritual adventurer such as the world needs. There are no heroes of action: only heroes of renunciation and suffering. Of such there are plenty. But few of them are known, and even these not to the crowd, but to the few." He realized that obstacles of almost unsurmountable character would be placed in his way, but he believed that his resources of strength and temperament were adequate to the task, at the same time realizing that he must be satisfied with something less than perfect fulfilment of his ideals.

The question of enrolling as a student in the University where he was already teaching raised a technical problem which was rather difficult of solution from the administrative side. However, he was able to arrange with the faculty to study medicine while he was still working in theology, giving concerts and lectures on Bach, and preaching.

Now for the first time in his life the natural sciences were opened up for him and he says:

> It was to me a spiritual experience. I had all along felt it to be psychically a danger that in the so-called Humanities with which I had been concerned hitherto, there is no truth which affirms itself as self-evident, but that a mere opinion can, by the way in which it deals with the subject-matter, obtain recognition as true. The search for truth in the domains of history and philosophy is carried on in constantly repeated endless duels between the sense of reality of the one and the inventive imaginative power of the other. The argument from facts is never able to obtain a definite victory over the skillfully produced opinion. How often does what is reckoned as progress consist in a skillfully argued opinion putting real insight out of action for a long time!

However, he did not lose his faith in the study of the Humanities, for as he puts it, "truth in thought is justified and necessary" and leads us to a sense of reality just as much as the study of the physical sciences. He was able to happily combine medicine and theology for his doctor's thesis, by discussing the psychic health of Jesus, looking at it now not only as a theologian but as a medical man.

There now arose a difficulty as to his being accepted by a mission on account of his radical theological ideas. Many missionary societies were afraid that when he once got away from their immediate control he would not only doctor Negroes but would preach heretical doctrines to them; so he finally had to promise that he would absolutely

put behind him all preaching and all teaching of the Bible and theology, and devote himself wholeheartedly to his medical practice. However, when he once got into the field of missionary endeavor, his fellow-workers were not so squeamish about his theology and he was soon pressed into preaching service, so that he continued to combine his love for these two activities. And because friends sent him an old square piano with organ pedals he was able to perfect himself in organ technique, and he also carried on his study and mastery of Bach.

The hospital which he found at Lambaréné was crude and terribly inefficient; it was overcrowded with patients, and his helpers were wholly inadequate. He therefore had to set himself the task of raising funds through his friends for entirely new hospital equipment. This, however, did not in the least discourage a man of such Protean energy, and he finally succeeded. Today he has a flourishing, adequate, scientifically equipped modern hospital.

Not long after he had gotten well under way, war came and, as he feared, his work was interfered with. Being a German-speaking Alsatian he was put under arrest, although treated kindly as long as he was in Africa, and was allowed to see some of his patients. The comment of one of the savages on the world war has deep meaning and irony for us: "What, so many men killed already in this war! Why don't their tribes meet and talk out the palaver? How can they ever pay for all these dead men?"

Schweitzer, having been brought up in a polyglot community of French and German, was deeply wounded in spirit by the war and was driven to think about the problems of our civilization. He therefore laid aside for the time being his studies in theology and medicine and music and began to tackle a philosophy of civilization. He worked long hours at night on it, finally coming to the conclusion that the fundamental need of the modern world is reverence for life. The most immediate fact of man's consciousness is the assertion: "I am life which wills to live, in the midst of life which wills to live." "A man is ethical only when life, as such, is sacred to him, that of plants and animals as that of his fellow men." "The world, however, offers us a horrible drama of Will-to-Live divided against itself."

He was later taken back to Europe as a prisoner of war, held in a typical prisoners' camp and for the most part treated as well as could be expected. Both he and his wife, however, had their health undermined by the exposure and the poor food.

At the end of the war he returned to his home, held a reunion with his family and friends, and soon was busy giving lectures, together with concerts, in Sweden, largely through the invitation of the famous Bishop Soderblöm. After returning home again from these lectures he set to work writing his recollections of Africa on a commission from a publishing house at Upsala. This work, *"Zwischen Wasser und Urwald,"* was immediately well-received in Sweden and translated again into several languages. In it he takes up the question of the justification of foreign missions, a problem which is much in the public eye at the present moment because of the report of a commission which has recently spent a year studying missions in the orient. Schweitzer's belief is that missions of a modern scientific kind are justified as an atonement for the evil that white men have done to the colored races. We have spread alcohol and sexual diseases, have increased sleeping sickness by enabling it to spread faster because of increased communication. Therefore we ought to atone for the terrible sufferings which we have placed upon the lives of these innocent people.

The book is an intensely interesting story of Schweitzer's life and thought. It is not great from the point of view of literature, but it is perhaps the best of Schweitzer's volumes to read for one who wants to become acquainted with the general outline of the man's career. Sandwiched in between the chapters of his life-story there are abstracts of most of his important works, so that the title, "Out of My Life and Thought," is well chosen.

CLARENCE R. SKINNER

Hymns and Poems

The author of the sixteen hymns and poems contained in this volume* is minister of the Unitarian Church in Reading, Massachusetts. The hymns have been written over a period of about twenty years, and nearly all of them have appeared in hymnals, or religious journals. Four of the earlier ones will be found in "The Hymn and Tune Book" (The Beacon Press, 1914), and several have been published in the *Christian Register.*

The hymns will appeal strongly to those who are theistic in their thought, for they are filled with expressions of faith in an over-ruling Providence. One or two deal with another aspect of religion. In "The Goal" we find an indictment of man for allowing himself to be ruled, even now, by his animal past, and for indulging in war and hatred. But as a whole the poems are of the more contemplative and quiet sort. The one entitled, "The Presence," is one of the very few hymns appropriate for use in the Communion Service of a liberal church—and it is an excellent hymn.

In most cases Mr. Ham is lyrical in expression, and his hymns have unity and coherence. There are a few instances of faulty meter which would make for difficulty in singing, but usually his lines flow evenly as lines in poems meant to be sung as hymns should. The collection does not contain any great hymns, but there are many which will provide comfort and inspiration for those who desire a positive faith in things of the spirit.

MARGUERITE EMILIO.

*"Songs of the Spirit," by Marion Franklin Ham. Published by the Beacon Press, Boston, Mass.

Thus My Soul

Like hidden cobwebs clinging strands
The fog steals down with clammy hands
And chokes the slowly waking city.

Thus my soul. The crass demands
Of sense befog its faint commands
And stifle truth without pity.

MONA MEDER NELSON.

The Field

(*Continued from page* 198)

as clearly depicted by anthropology and history, are the product of a gradual development due to his interaction with his natural environment and with his social heritage. The individual born into a particular culture is largely molded by that culture.

Fifth: Humanism asserts that the nature of the universe depicted by modern science makes unacceptable any supernatural or cosmic guarantees of human values. Obviously humanism does not deny the possibility of realities as yet undiscovered, but it does insist that the way to determine the existence and value of any and all realities is by means of intelligent inquiry and by the assessment of their relation to human needs. Religion must formulate its hopes and plans in the light of the scientific spirit and method.

Sixth: We are convinced that the time has passed for theism, deism, modernism, and the several varieties of "new thought."

Seventh: Religion consists of those actions, purposes, and experiences which are humanly significant. Nothing human is alien to the religious. It includes labor, art, science, philosophy, love, friendship, recreation—all that is in its degree expressive of intelligently satisfying human living. The distinction between the sacred and the secular can no longer be maintained.

Eighth: Religious humanism considers the complete realization of human personality to be the end of man's life and seeks its development and fulfilment in the here and now. This is the explanation of the humanist's social passion.

Ninth: In the place of the old attitudes involved in worship and prayer the humanist finds his religious emotions expressed in a heightened sense of personal life and in a cooperative effort to promote social well-being.

Tenth: It follows that there will be no uniquely religious emotions and attitudes of the kind hitherto associated with belief in the supernatural.

Eleventh: Man will learn to face the crises of life in terms of his knowledge of their naturalness and probability. Reasonable and manly attitudes will be fostered by education and supported by custom. We assume that humanism will take the path of social and mental hygiene and discourage sentimental and unreal hopes and wishful thinking.

Twelfth: Believing that religion must work increasingly for joy in living, religious humanists aim to foster the creative in man and to encourage achievements that add to the satisfactions of life.

Thirteenth: Religious humanism maintains that all associations and institutions exist for the fulfillment of human life. The intelligent evaluation, transformation, control, and direction of such associations and institutions with a view to the enhancement of human life is the purpose and program of humanism. Certainly religious institutions, their ritualistic forms, ecclesiastical methods, and communal activities must be reconstituted as rapidly as experience allows, in order to function effectively in the modern world.

Fourteenth: The humanists are firmly convinced that existing acquisitive and profit-motivated society has shown itself to be inadequate and that a radical change in methods, controls, and motives must be instituted. A socialized and cooperative economic order must be established to the end that the equitable distribution of the means of life be possible. The goal of humanism is a free and universal society in which people voluntarily and intelligently cooperate for the common good. Humanists demand a shared life in a shared world.

Fifteenth and last: We assert that humanism will: (a) affirm life rather than deny it; (b) seek to elicit the possibilities of life, not flee from it; and (c) endeavor to establish the conditions of a satisfactory life for all, not merely for the few. By this positive morale and intention humanism will be guided, and from this perspective and alignment the techniques and efforts of humanism will flow.

So stand the theses of religious humanism. Though we consider the religious forms and ideas of our fathers no longer adequate, the quest for the good life is still the central task for mankind. Man is at last becoming aware that he alone is responsible for the realization of the world of his dreams, that he has within himself the power for its achievement. He must set intelligence and will to the task.

(Signed)

J. A. C. Fagginer Auer, Parkman Professor of Church History and Theology, Harvard University; Professor of Church History, Tufts College.

E. Burdette Backus, Unitarian Minister.

Harry Elmer Barnes, General Editorial Department, Scripps-Howard Newspapers.

L. M. Birkhead, The Liberal Center, Kansas City, Missouri.

Raymond B. Bragg, Secretary, Western Unitarian Conference.

Edwin Arthur Burtt, Professor of Philosophy, Sage School of Philosophy, Cornell University.

Ernest Caldecott, Minister, First Unitarian Church, Los Angeles, California.

A. J. Carlson, Professor of Physiology, University of Chicago.

John Dewey, Columbia University.

Albert C. Dieffenbach, Formerly Editor of *The Christian Register.*

John H. Dietrich, Minister, First Unitarian Society, Minneapolis.

Bernard Fantus, Professor of Therapeutics, College of Medicine, University of Illinois.

William Floyd, Editor of the *Arbitrator,* New York City.

F. H. Hankins, Professor of Economics and Sociology, Smith College.

A. Eustace Haydon, Professor of History of Religions, University of Chicago.

Llewellyn Jones, Literary critic and author.

Robert Morss Lovett, Editor, *The New Republic;* Professor of English, University of Chicago.

Harold P. Marley, Minister, The Fellowship of Liberal Religion, Ann Arbor, Michigan.

R. Lester Mondale, Minister, Unitarian Church, Evanston, Illinois.

Charles Francis Potter, Leader and Founder, the First Humanist Society of New York, Inc.

John Herman Randall, Jr., Department of Philosophy, Columbia University.

Curtis W. Reese, Dean, Abraham Lincoln Center, Chicago.

Oliver L. Reiser, Associate Professor of Philosophy, University of Pittsburgh.

Roy Wood Sellars, Professor of Philosophy, University of Michigan.

Clinton Lee Scott, Minister, Universalist Church, Peoria, Illinois.

Maynard Shipley, President, The Science League of America.

W. Frank Swift, Director, Boston Ethical Society.

V. T. Thayer, Educational Director, Ethical Culture Schools.

Eldred C. Vanderlaan, Leader of the Free Fellowship, Berkeley, California.

Joseph Walker, Attorney, Boston, Massachusetts.

Jacob J. Weinstein, Rabbi, Advisor to Jewish Students, Columbia University.

Frank S. C. Wicks, All Souls Unitarian Church, Indianapolis.

David Rhys Williams, Minister, Unitarian Church, Rochester, N. Y.

Edwin H. Wilson, Managing Editor, *The New Humanist,* Chicago, Illinois. Minister, Third Unitarian Church, Chicago, Illinois.

Comment by

I. John Haynes Holmes

I have been studying with the utmost care the Manifesto which you are preparing to publish, for I count myself a humanist in the broader and more inclusive sense of the word.

Nearly every one of the items of your program is satisfactory to me, although I might desire to change the wording here and there. But there is one exception—the Sixth, I do not feel, and certainly do not want to assert, that "the time has passed for theism"! I have never at any time seen any necessary contradiction between humanism on the one hand and theism on the other. Indeed, I believe that a true theism inevitably unfolds into a rational theism, or may at least be consistent therewith. Theism is to my mind the blossom which grows upon the plant of humanism, the poetry into which it unfolds in mystic beauty. As I look at it, God is only another word for Humanity, as America is only another word for the United States.

You speak of deism! Well, now, deism isn't half bad! As a precise type of philosophical and theological thought it is, of course, old-fashioned and terribly unscientific, but it has a fundamental poetic value. After all, there is a religion of nature—see Wordsworth—and deism was a crude attempt to explain it, if you know what I mean. At bottom, I don't see why, in a modern Manifesto, the word "deism" should appear at all, as it belongs to the eighteenth century. You wouldn't refer in this statement to Platonism, positivism, or monism—why bother with deism?

As for modernism, I think this is a terribly loose word. Who knows what you mean? Why isn't humanism to be regarded as modernism of the best

type? Modernism to my mind depends on the modernist—that is, upon the man who holds it—and I would not deny the term as applied either to you or to me. The word has no definite content at all, and therefore to my mind should not be used.

What I am objecting to at bottom is the whole spirit of this Sixth Thesis. You are arbitrarily ruling out from our thought something about which you know absolutely nothing at all. You are insisting, or at least suggesting, that in some way, traditional or otherwise, there is a fundamental contradiction between humanism and theism. I deny this! I insist that they are complementary. From one point of view at least, I would describe humanism as the right road to theism. Whether you and I, in travelling this road, will ever arrive at our goal is a question. It may be a question as to whether the road has ever been broken through to the goal. You have perhaps travelled as far as the road can take you, and I am insisting on going on and losing myself in the unexplored landscape. What you are trying to say in your Manifesto, or the most of what you are trying to say, is that the humanist road, as far as it goes, is the only road a sound thinker can travel. And I deny that you have any right to say that the road ends at the point where you stop your journey and that nothing lies beyond.

II. M. C. Otto

Publication of the "Humanist Manifesto" will, in my opinion, serve no sufficient purpose. I cannot believe with you that it will clarify the public mind, or do constructive work for the cause. A set of fifteen principles, detached from the living experience which precipitated them and lacking the life and warmth of the interests they represent, can do little to inform the mind and nothing to stir the heart. Humanism—if I understand the philosophy of it—cannot be "sold" to people. If the "Manifesto" were a rallying-cry issuing with glowing conviction from a group on the march together, or if it gave promise of gripping men and women of humanistic leanings, drawing them into closer, more understanding and more active unity, it would be a desirable signal. Unfortunately, I see no such service in it. And experience has taught me to beware of deceiving myself into thinking something has really been done when all that has been done is that something has been said. It would be easier for me to write, "Sure, go ahead, put me down." If I take the harder course and do not sign the document which I know will carry the names of men I greatly admire and respect, it is because of a deep conviction that the "Manifesto" will prove to be an ineffectual gesture, and a tactical error.

—*The New Humanist.*

Commonwealth Summer Camp

The Commonwealth College Summer Camp, to be held for ten weeks beginning July 3 on the college site in the wooded Ouachita Mountains near Mena, Ark., offers a vacation combining intellectual stimulation with recreation. The full cost, including room, board, laundry service and tuition, is as low as $4 a week.

In addition to members of the regular college staff, Nathan Fine, director of the research department of the Rand School of Social Science and editor of the American Labor Year Book, Carl Brannin, co-founder of the Seattle Unemployed Citizens' League, and Oscar Ameringer, editor of the *American Guardian*, will lecture and lead in discussions. Discussion topics will center around, "Is American Culture Going Left?" and "Economics and Politics—Where Are We Headed?" Mr. Fine will be on the staff all summer, Mr. Brannin the last two weeks in July, and Mr. Ameringer the first two weeks in August.

Sessions of the Commonwealth Labor Orientation course, giving a summary of history and current problems from a labor point of view, will be open to all. There will be other classes for regularly enrolled students.

Recreational opportunities include sports, hiking, a social program, a labor theatre, and swimming in the creek that borders on the college campus.

Because of the communal type of organization of Commonwealth College, visitors who desire to help 15 hours a week with farm and community tasks may reduce costs for room, board and laundry service to $40 for the ten-week term, or $25 a month or $1 a day for shorter periods. Those not so participating pay double. Proceeds help maintain the year-round workers' education program of the College.

For further particulars address the Executive Secretary, Commonwealth College, Mena, Arkansas.

Ammunition for Peace-Lovers

"Will in No Circumstances Fight for King and Country"

By Sydney Strong

A single page leaflet, reprinted from UNITY of April 10, 1933.

100 for 35 cents

25 for 10 cents

Address L. G. Wentworth,
41 Kilsyth Road, Brookline, Mass.

La Follette's
Great National Weekly Newspaper
THE PROGRESSIVE

In every issue it is fighting your battles against monopoly and organized wealth in government

SPECIAL OFFER
4 Months
— 21 — ISSUES
50c

STARTLING facts suppressed by other papers will be revealed in the next few issues. Send 50 cents today and be sure to receive the next extraordinarily interesting issues of La Follette's great weekly newspaper.
The Progressive, Dept. B., Madison, Wis.

New and Revised Edition

INDIA IN BONDAGE

by JABEZ T. SUNDERLAND, M. A., D. D.

Brought Strictly Up-to-Date—8 New Chapters on

The Momentous Events of the Last Two Years in England and India—India's Future—Will Gandhi Win?—Will There be a Bloody Revolution?—Is the New Constitution which Britain is Forging for India, a CHARTER OF FREEDOM, or a STEEL FRAME OR STRONGER BONDAGE?

$2.00 at All Bookstores or Direct from

LEWIS COPELAND COMPANY, 570 Lexington Ave., New York

An Unusual Issue!

The New Humanist

for May-June

contains the full text and signatures of

A HUMANIST MANIFESTO

with an explanation by Raymond B. Bragg and *critical comment by* John Haynes Holmes, M. C. Otto, Arthur E. Morgan and Harold Buschman.

also articles and reviews:

HUMANIST RELIGION
Roy Wood Sellars

A MYSTICAL MOOD
Rupert Holloway

HUMANISM AND SOCIAL INTELLIGENCE
Oliver L. Reiser

RECENT SOCIAL TRENDS
Roland R. Renne

NATURALISM AND PHYSICAL REALISM
Edgar S. Brightman
J. A. C. F. Auer

BEAUTY IN A MACHINE AGE
F. S. Stowell

HUMANISM FOR LAYMEN
Curtis W. Reese

Yearly $1.00 *Single Copies 20c*

THE NEW HUMANIST
105 South Dearborn Street
Chicago, Illinois